

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 08-CR-148

MARY SCHAEUBLE,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER ADOPTING RECOMMENDATION OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

---

The Defendant Mary Schaeuble is charged in a thirteen-count indictment with Embezzlement of Assets contrary to Title 29 U.S.C. § 501(c). On June 26, 2008, defendant filed a motion for suppression of evidence and requested an evidentiary hearing (Docket # 10). As is the practice in this district, the motions were referred to the assigned magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). An evidentiary hearing was held August 4, 2008 and a briefing schedule was set. The Government filed a response brief on August 27, 2008 and no reply brief was filed. In a well-reasoned decision, Magistrate Judge William E. Callahan, Jr. issued his recommendation on September 18, 2008, that the motion to suppress be denied.

The ten days allowed for the filing of written objections to the proposed findings and recommendation of the magistrate judge have passed and no objections have been filed. If no objection or only a partial objection is made, the district court judge reviews the unobjected-to portions of a magistrate judge's recommendation for clear error. *Johnson v. Zema Sys. Corp.*, 170 F.3d 734, 739 (7th Cir. 1999). The clear error standard means that I can overturn the magistrate

judge's ruling only if I am "left with the definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been made."  
*Weeks v. Samsung Heavy Indus. Co.*, 126 F.3d 926, 943 (7th Cir. 1997).

Here, I am satisfied from my review of the magistrate judge's recommendation that he did not commit clear error. I therefore accept the recommendation and adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth therein as my own.

Dated this 30<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2008.

s/ William C. Griesbach  
\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM C. GRIESBACH  
United States District Judge